arXiv:1606.03899v1 [q-fin.MF] 13 Jun 2016

Exact Smooth Term Structure Estimation*

Damir Filipović Sander Willems
EPFL and Swiss Finance Institute

June 14, 2016

Abstract

We introduce a novel method to estimate the discount curve from market quotes based on the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse such that 1) the market quotes are exactly replicated, 2) the curve has maximal smoothness, 3) no ad hoc interpolation is needed, and 4) no numerical root-finding algorithms are required. We provide a full theoretical framework as well as practical applications for both single-curve and multi-curve estimation.

JEL Classification: C61, E43, G12

Keywords: Bootstrap, Discount Curve, Forward Curve, Splines, Term Structure Estimation

1 Introduction

In financial models it is often assumed that we can observe an initial term structure of zero-coupon bond prices for the continuum of maturities, also known as the discount curve. In practice, however, zero-coupon bonds are rarely traded and the discount curve has to be derived from prices of actively traded fixed-income instruments such as coupon bonds, interest rate swaps or futures. Since the discount curve is an infinite-dimensional object, we need an interpolation method to complete the information obtained from the finite number of observed market instruments. Broadly speaking we can divide term structure estimation methods in two categories: smoothing methods and exact methods.

Smoothing methods assume that prices of market instruments are observed with an error and try to find a smooth discount curve that matches the prices *as close as possible*. They typically impose a parametric specification for (parts of) the discount curve and calibrate

*We thank Jeroen Kerkhof for comments. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 307465-POLYTE.

the parameters by minimizing the pricing error. Examples of single-piece functions that are defined over the entire maturity domain include the seminal work of Nelson and Siegel (1987) and Svensson (1994). Rather than specifying a single function for the entire maturity spectrum, polynomial spline methods impose a piecewise polynomial specification. The parameters of the polynomials are then estimated to minimize the pricing error. Examples include McCulloch (1971, 1975), Vasicek and Fong (1982) and Fisher et al. (1995). In general smoothing methods are preferred for more qualitative studies where the general shape of the curve is more important than the exact values. Smoothing methods are for example very popular in central banks to support the monetary policy decisions.

Exact methods, on the other hand, guarantee that the resulting discount curve perfectly reproduces the prices of the instruments used in the estimation. This is of prime importance to trading desks and risk management because they have to mark to market their books within a single arbitrage-free valuation framework. The idea, also called *bootstrapping*, is to iteratively build up the term structure from instruments with shorter maturities to longer maturities. Interpolation methods play a crucial role in bootstrapping. Indeed, as we move to instruments with longer maturities, we might lack information about certain discount factors to value the instrument. These missing discount factors have to be obtained by interpolation in order to proceed with the bootstrap. The choice of interpolation method can have significant impact on the shape of the resulting forward curves, see e.g. Hagan and West (2006). Simple linear interpolation of rates leads for example to the notorious *sawtooth* shapes in the forward curve. Higher order interpolation methods typically give smoother curves, however this usually comes at the cost of having to resort to numerical root-solving algorithms to calculate the discount curve. In sum, there is no generally accepted interpolation method that should be used in a bootstrap.

In this paper we introduce a very easy to use exact method based on the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse. The user of our method does not have to worry at all about interpolation because we search in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert function space for a curve that has minimal norm. We define the norm in this space in such a way that it serves as a measure of the smoothness of the curve. The optimal discount curve is given in closed form and requires only simple linear algebra calculations. Depending on the definition of the norm, we obtain a piecewise-linear or a piecewise-cubic function for the optimal discount curve.

Our paper shares some similarities with Deaves and Parlar (2000) in the sense that they also propose a generalized exact bootstrap method. There are however several key differences. First, they only consider coupon bearing bonds as inputs while we stay fully general and consider quotes of any (linear) fixed-income instrument. They deal with the problem of missing data points by interpolating yields with symbolic cubic splines. To construct the spline equations and to solve for the yield curve, they have to resort to sophisticated symbolic software packages. In contrast, the most complicated operation in our method is a simple inversion of a low-dimensional matrix that is invertible by construction. Moreover we also provide a full theoretical framework that justifies the fact that we call the resulting curve optimally smooth. Our theoretical setup is related to Delbaen and Lorimier (1992), Adams and Van Deventer (1994) and Lim and Xiao (2002), however they all assume that

the prices of a finite number of zero-coupon bonds (or, equivalently, yields) are given and therefore they only face an interpolation problem. Since zero-coupon bonds are not (liquidly) traded, we abstract from this assumption and assume in full generality that we observe instruments whose value depends linearly on the (unknown) zero-coupon bond prices.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 casts the term structure estimation problem and shortly reviews the steps taken in a traditional bootstrap. Section 3 presents the theory behind our proposed new method to extract an optimally smooth discount curve in a conveniently defined Hilbert space. Section 4 gives a practical application for single-curve estimation. Section 5 gives a practical application for multi-curve estimation. Section 6 concludes. The appendix contains all proofs and an alternative discrete estimation method.

2 Estimation problem

Let t_0 denote the spot date for which we observe the prices $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ of n fixed income instruments. Denote by $t_0 \leq t_1 < \cdots < t_N$ the union of all the cashflow dates of these instruments and call $C = (c_{ij})$ the corresponding $n \times N$ cashflow matrix.[1] If instrument i does not have a cashflow at time t_j, then we simply set $c_{ij} = 0$. The information contained in these n instruments about the discount curve can be summarized by a linear system as follows:

$$Cd = p, \tag{1}$$

with $d = (P(t_0, t_1), \dots, P(t_0, t_N))^\top$ and where $P(t, T)$ denotes the price at time t of a zero-coupon bond maturing at date T. If C were an invertible square matrix, then there would exist a unique solution to this system: $d = C^{-1}p$. In reality, however, we typically have many more cashflow dates than instruments ($n \ll N$) that we can use for the estimation. In other words, the linear system $Cd = p$ is under-determined and there exist many discount vectors d that satisfy the relation in (1).[2] The crucial question is then of course which of the admissible discount vectors should be chosen. Moreover, even if we have somehow managed to choose a particular admissible vector d, we still face an interpolation problem in order to arrive at a continuous discount curve $g(x) = P(t_0, t_0+x)$ for time to maturity $x \geq 0$.

Bootstrapping is a common practice among trading desks to construct a discount curve from a limited number of carefully selected liquid market instruments such that the resulting curve perfectly reproduces the prices of the instruments used in the estimation. There is no unique bootstrapping method and it is likely that there are at least as many methods as there are trading desks in the world. In this section we give a very brief description of some methods, for a more detailed overview of the most popular (single-curve) bootstrapping methods used in practice we refer to Hagan and West (2006, 2008).

[1] By cashflow dates we mean every date that is relevant for the pricing of the instrument.

[2] Assuming the system is not inconsistent, i.e. instruments that can be replicated as a linear combination of other instruments must have the same price (no-arbitrage).

The easiest approach is to synthetically create $N-n$ market instruments by interpolation such that the augmented $N \times N$ cashflow matrix C_{aug} becomes lower triangular (possibly after a permutation on the rows). This way the system $C_{aug}d = p_{aug}$ can easily be solved iteratively by means of forward substitution. In order to price these synthetic instruments explicitly by interpolation, it is necessary that the chosen instruments have overlapping cashflow dates. For example, suppose we have LIBOR rates with maturities t_1 and t_2 and the par rate of a swap with cashflows at t_3 and t_4. The discount factors $P(t_0, t_1)$ and $P(t_0, t_2)$ are readily obtained, however no unique solution exists for $P(t_0, t_3)$ and $P(t_0, t_4)$ since they are determined by just one swap rate. If $t_1 < t_3 < t_2 < t_4$ then we can synthetically create the zero-coupon bond $P(t_0, t_3)$ by interpolating between $P(t_0, t_1)$ and $P(t_0, t_2)$.[3] This interpolation would not be possible explicitly if $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_4$.

More generally, one can a priori impose an explicit parametric form for the discount curve: $g(x) = g(x; z)$ for some parameter z with dimension less than or equal to the number of observed instruments n. The pricing system (1) then becomes a system of possibly nonlinear equations in z:

$$C(g(x_1; z), \ldots, g(x_N; z))^\top = p,$$

for $x_j := t_j - t_0$. Assuming that the gradients $\nabla_z g(x_j, z)$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$, are linearly independent, the inverse mapping theorem asserts that this system is no longer (locally) under-determined with respect to the parameter z. If it admits a solution z^* then it is (locally around z^*) unique. The choice of a suitable parametric form $g(x; z)$ is however not straightforward. One possibility is to choose a polynomial of degree $n-1$, also known as the Lagrange polynomial. Although this function is very smooth and flexible enough to satisfy n constraints, it demonstrates strong oscillatory behavior. A standard solution to this so called 'roller coaster' effect is to describe the discount curve by splines, i.e. piece-wise low-dimensional polynomials. There are many different ways to specify the functional form of a spline and the position of the knot points, see for example McCulloch (1971, 1975), Steeley (1991) and Adams (2001). It is important to note that in all these cases the spline solution is imposed *a priori* and the knot points are chosen manually. The new method we present in the next section produces also a spline. However, it remains fully non-parametric in the sense that the spline is the outcome of a proper optimization problem which endogenously determines the optimal positions of the knot points.

3 Pseudoinverse on Hilbert spaces

Instead of first finding a discount vector $d = (P(t_0, t_1), \ldots, P(t_0, t_N))^\top$ satisfying (1) and in a second step interpolating these discount factors to a continuous discount curve, we now directly search for a discount curve in a convenient Hilbert function space that is optimal in the sense of having minimal norm. The optimal discount curve is explicitly calculated through the pseudoinverse of a continuous linear map.

[3] This can be any interpolation technique, not necessarily linear.

3.1 Optimal first-order smoothness

We fix a finite time to maturity horizon $\bar{\tau}$ large enough to contain all cashflow dates. We define the Hilbert space of discount curves H_1 which consists of absolutely continuous real functions $g\colon [0,\bar{\tau}] \to \mathbb{R}$ with norm given by

$$\|g\|_{H_1}^2 = \langle g, g\rangle_{H_1} = g(0)^2 + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} g'(x)^2 \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2}$$

For any $\tau \in [0,\bar{\tau}]$ we define the linear functional $\Phi_\tau : H_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ which evaluates the discount curve at τ:

$$\Phi_\tau(g) = g(\tau). \tag{3}$$

By the Riesz representation theorem (Riesz (1909)) there exists a unique element $\phi_\tau \in H_1$ such that for any $g \in H_1$ we have

$$\Phi_\tau(g) = \langle \phi_\tau, g\rangle_{H_1}.$$

The following lemma gives an explicit expression for this element.

Lemma 3.1. *The linear functional Φ_τ on H_1 can be uniquely represented by the element $\phi_\tau \in H_1$ given by:*

$$\phi_\tau(x) = 1 + x \wedge \tau$$

where we write $x \wedge \tau := \min(x,\tau)$.

Let us define the linear map $M\colon H_1 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by:

$$Mg = C(\Phi_{x_1}(g), \ldots, \Phi_{x_N}(g))^\top \tag{4}$$

where C is just as before the $n \times N$ cashflow matrix with n the number of market quotes and we denote the times to cashflow dates $x_j = t_j - t_0$, $j = 1,\ldots,N$. We henceforth assume that C has full rank.[4]

We now find the discount curve with minimal H_1-norm that matches all market quotes. That is, we solve the following infinite-dimensional optimization problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{g\in H_1} & \frac{1}{2}\|g\|_{H_1}^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & Mg = p. \end{array} \tag{5}$$

The solution of (5) is an explicit piecewise-linear function, as shown in the following theorem:

[4]This is no loss of generality. Indeed, if C would not have full rank, we would be including redundant instruments in our estimation as they can be replicated by linear combinations of other instruments. In other words we can omit them from the estimation without losing any information.

Theorem 3.2. *There exists a unique solution $g^* \in H_1$ to the optimization problem (5). It is given as*

$$g^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \, \phi_{x_j}(x) \tag{6}$$

with $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N)^\top = C^\top \left(CAC^\top\right)^{-1} p$ and A is the symmetric invertible $N \times N$-matrix with components

$$A_{ij} = \langle \phi_{x_i}, \phi_{x_j} \rangle_{H_1} = 1 + x_i \wedge x_j.$$

Remark 3.3. *Since the discount curve starts at face value, $P(t_0, t_0) = 1$, we henceforth impose $g(0) = 1$ by setting $t_1 = t_0$ such that $x_1 = 0$, $p_1 = 1$, $c_{11} = 1$, and $c_{1j} = c_{i1} = 0$ for all $i, j \neq 1$.*

We have therefore explicitly constructed the discount curve $x \mapsto g^*(x)$ that exactly replicates the prices p of the instruments with cashflows C and moreover it is the smoothest curve to do so among all absolutely continuous real functions in the sense that it minimizes the integrated squared first-order derivative, $\int_0^{\bar\tau} g'(x)^2 \, \mathrm{d}x$.

The corresponding instantaneous forward curve $f\colon [0, \bar\tau] \to \mathbb{R}$ can also easily be computed in closed form:

$$f(x) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \ln(g^*(x)) = -\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n z_j \, \phi'_{x_j}(x)}{\sum_{j=1}^n z_j \, \phi_{x_j}(x)}$$

where $\phi'_\tau(x) = 1_{[0,\tau]}(x)$.[5]

Remark 3.4. *As shown in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can write the optimal discount curve as $g^* = M^+ p$, where $M^+\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to H_1$ is the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of the continuous linear map $M : H_1 \to \mathbb{R}^n$.*

3.2 Optimal second-order smoothness

We obtain a smoother discount curve when searching in the Hilbert space H_2 of real functions $g\colon [0, \bar\tau] \to \mathbb{R}$ with absolutely continuous first derivative and norm given by

$$\|g\|_{H_2}^2 = \langle g, g \rangle_{H_2} = g(0)^2 + g'(0)^2 + \int_0^{\bar\tau} g''(x)^2 \, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{7}$$

Define the linear maps $\Phi_\tau\colon H_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ and $M\colon H_2 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as in (3) and (4). Again by the Riesz representation theorem there exists for every $\tau \in [0, \bar\tau]$ a unique element $\psi_\tau \in H_2$ such that for any $g \in H_2$ we have:

$$\Phi_\tau(g) = \langle \psi_\tau, g \rangle_{H_2}.$$

The following lemma gives the explicit expression for ψ_τ.

[5] That is, we define $\phi'_\tau(\tau) = \phi'_\tau(0) = 1$.

Lemma 3.5. *The linear functional Φ_τ on H_2 can be uniquely represented by the element $\psi_\tau \in H_2$ given by:*

$$\psi_\tau(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{6}(x \wedge \tau)^3 + \frac{\tau}{2}(x \wedge \tau)^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{2}(x \wedge \tau) + x\left(1 + \frac{\tau}{2}\right)\tau.$$

The solution to the optimization problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{g \in H_2} & \frac{1}{2}\|g\|^2_{H_2} \\ \text{s.t.} & Mg = p. \end{array} \tag{8}$$

is given by a piecewise-cubic function as shown in the following theorem:

Theorem 3.6. *There exists a unique solution $g^* \in H_2$ to the optimization problem (8). It is given as*

$$g^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \, \psi_{x_j}(x) \tag{9}$$

with $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N)^\top = C^\top \left(CBC^\top\right)^{-1} p$ and B is the symmetric invertible $N \times N$-matrix with components

$$B_{ij} = \langle \psi_{x_i}, \psi_{x_j} \rangle_{H_2} = 1 - \frac{1}{6}(x_i \wedge x_j)^3 + x_i x_j \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} x_i \wedge x_j\right).$$

We impose $g(0) = 1$ as described in Remark 3.3. From Theorem 3.6 we thus obtain the discount curve $x \mapsto g^*(x)$ that exactly replicates the prices p of the instruments with cashflows C and moreover it is the smoothest curve to do so among all real functions with absolutely continuous first derivative in the sense that it minimizes the sum of the squared initial slope and the integrated squared second-order derivative, $g'(0)^2 + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} g''(x)^2 \, \mathrm{d}x$.

The corresponding instantaneous forward curve $f \colon [0, \bar{\tau}] \to \mathbb{R}$ is given explicitly by:

$$f(x) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \ln(g^*(x)) = -\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n z_j \, \psi'_{x_j}(x)}{\sum_{j=1}^n z_j \, \psi_{x_j}(x)}$$

where $\psi'_\tau(x) = \tau - \frac{1}{2}(x \wedge \tau)^2 + \tau(x \wedge \tau)$.

Remark 3.7. *For readers unfamiliar with infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, we refer to Appendix B where we present a discrete analogue of the method introduced here. Instead of an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, we search for a discount vector in the Euclidian space that has maximal smoothness according to the discrete analogues of the H_1- and H_2-norms, respectively.*

4 Single-curve estimation example

In this example we assume a single-curve world, i.e. where we use the same curve for both discounting as well as the projection of forward rates. We consider data from the

US money and swap markets as of 1st of October 2012, as shown in Table 1. More specifically we look at three USD LIBOR rates (overnight, 1M and 3M) with maturity dates $S = \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$, five futures contracts on the 3M LIBOR and nine par swap rates with annual paying fixed leg. The futures contracts are quoted as:

$$100(1 - F_{futures}(t_0, T_{i-1}, T_i)), \quad i = 1, \ldots, 7,$$

with $F_{futures}(t_0, T_{i-1}, T_i)$ denoting the futures rate and $T = \{T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_7\}$ the corresponding reset/settlement dates. We ignore any convexity adjustments and take the futures rate as the simple forward rate to keep the estimation procedure model-independent.[6] Finally we denote by $U = \{U_1, \ldots, U_{30}\}$ the cashflow dates of the swaps.

4.1 Traditional bootstrap

We first perform a classical bootstrap where we interpolate all the missing simple spot and swap rates linearly. We assume the daycount convention Actual/360 for all the instruments. Remark first the overlapping cashflow dates of the different instruments:

$$t_0 < S_1 < \mathbf{S_2} < \mathbf{T_0} < \mathbf{S_3} < T_1 < T_2 < \mathbf{T_3} < \mathbf{U_1} < \mathbf{T_4} < T_5 < U_2 < \cdots < U_{30}. \tag{10}$$

The prices of the discount bonds $P(t_0, S_1)$, $P(t_0, S_2)$ and $P(t_0, S_3)$ are readily obtained from the given LIBOR rates. At the reset date of the first futures contract, we obtain the simple spot rate $L(t_0, T_0)$ by linear interpolation of the last two LIBOR rates:

$$L(t_0, T_0) = wL(t_0, S_2) + (1 - w)L(t_0, S_3), \quad w = \frac{\delta(T_0, S_3)}{\delta(S_2, S_3)}.$$

The discount factor $P(t_0, T_0)$ is now recovered from the interpolated simple spot rate $L(t_0, T_0)$. Treating the futures rates as simple forward rates, we have all the information needed to compute $P(t_0, T_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, 5$, iteratively from:

$$P(t_0, T_i) = \frac{P(t_0, T_{i-1})}{1 + \delta(T_{i-1}, T_i)F(t_0, T_{i-1}, T_i)}.$$

For the swaps we exploit again the overlapping cashflow dates to obtain $P(t_0, U_1)$ by linearly interpolating between $L(t_0, T_3)$ and $L(t_0, T_4)$. The swap rate $R_{swap}(t_0, U_1)$ of the swap with just one cashflow at U_1 can be calculated from the discount bond price $P(t_0, U_1)$. The remaining discount factors are now obtained by iterated use of the formula:

$$P(t_0, U_i) = \frac{1 - R_{swap}(t_0, U_i) \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta(U_{j-1}, U_j) P(t_0, U_j)}{1 + R_{swap}(t_0, U_i)\delta(U_{i-1}, U_i)}, \quad i = 2, \ldots, 30,$$

where all the missing swap rates are obtained by linear interpolation.

[6] The convexity adjustments are only a fraction of basis points because of the short maturities, so they do not make much qualitative difference.

From the bootstrapped zero-coupon bond prices we now compute the simple spot rates, yields and consecutive simple forward rates. The result is shown in Figure 1. Although the simple spot and yield curves look fairly smooth, the same cannot be said of the forward curve. This well known 'sawtooth'-behaviour of the forward curve is a consequence of the linear interpolation. Other interpolation techniques may lead to improved smoothness of the forward curve, however choosing the correct technique remains somewhat arbitrary and can lead to a significant increase in complexity.

4.2 Pseudoinverse

The pseudoinverse method that we introduced in Section 3 does not require any ad hoc interpolation. We only have to construct our cashflow matrix and the smoothness maximization criterion uses the remaining degrees of freedom in an optimal way. The cashflow matrix C in this example has dimension 18×40, one row for every observed instrument and an additional row to impose $P(t_0, t_0) = 1$ (see Remark 3.3). The columns represent all the dates relevant in the valuation of the instruments (i.e. the dates shown in (10)).

The LIBOR rates $L(t_0, S_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, can be represented as instruments that have price 1 today and cashflow $1+\delta(t_0, S_i)L(t_0, S_i)$ at time S_i. The simple forward rates $F(t_0, T_{i-1}, T_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, 5$, can be seen as instruments with price 0 today, cashflow -1 at time T_{i-1} and another cashflow of $1 + \delta(t_0, T_i)F(t_0, T_{i-1}, T_i)$ at time T_i. For the swaps with maturity U_i, $i = 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 15, 20, 30$, we recall the definition of the par swap rate $R_{swap}(U_i)$:

$$1 - P(t_0, U_i) = R_{swap}(U_i) \sum_{j=1}^{i} \delta(U_{j-1}, U_j) P(t_0, U_j)$$

where we set $U_0 := t_0$. We see that this is equivalent to an instrument with price 1 today, cashflow $\delta(U_{j-1}, U_j)R_{swap}(U_i)$ at time U_j, $j = 1, \ldots, i-1$, and a final cashflow $1 + \delta(U_{i-1}, U_i)R_{swap}(U_i)$ at time U_i. The vector p and the first 13 columns of the matrix C therefore take the following form:

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc} t_0 & S_1 & S_2 & T_0 & S_3 & T_1 & T_2 & T_3 & U_1 & T_4 & T_5 & U_2 & U_3 & \cdots & \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & c_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & c_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{34} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & c_{45} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & c_{56} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & c_{67} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & c_{79} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & c_{8,10} & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{98} & 0 & 0 & c_{9,11} & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{10,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{10,11} & c_{10,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{11,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{11,11} & c_{11,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{12,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{12,11} & c_{12,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{13,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{13,11} & c_{13,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{14,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{14,11} & c_{14,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{15,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{15,11} & c_{15,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{16,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{16,11} & c_{16,12} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{17,8} & 0 & 0 & c_{17,11} & c_{17,12} & \cdots \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \\ P(t_0,t_0)=1 \\ LIBOR \\ LIBOR \\ LIBOR \\ Futures \\ Futures \\ Futures \\ Futures \\ Futures \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \\ Swap \end{array}.$$

In Figure 2 we have plotted the simple spot rates, yields and instantaneous forward rates obtained from the pseudoinverse method presented in Section 3. We see that the second-order smoothing criterion gives the most satisfactory results in terms of shape. Another interesting feature that is worth investigating is of course the stability of our method. More specifically, we are interested in how sensitive the instantaneous forward curve is with respect to changes in the input rates. In Figure 3 we plot the absolute change in the instantaneous forward rate (in basis points) when we bump the rate of one of the instruments with one basis point. To investigate the locality of the method, we choose to bump instruments with maturities in the short, mid and long end of the maturity spectrum: the 3 month LIBOR rate, the September 2013 futures rate and the 15 year swap rate. We see that the first-order smoothing method outperforms the second-order one in terms of locality. For example, when bumping the 15 year swap rate the first-order smoothing method only produces a change in the forward curve from 10 to 20 years to maturity (i.e. between the maturities of the adjacent input swaps). In the case of the second-order smoothing method, however, there are distortions over nearly the entire maturity spectrum. To sum up, the second-order smoothing method has the advantage of providing a very smooth forward curve, however this comes at the cost of a lowered locality. Following Andersen (2007), we could introduce an alternative norm defined as a convex combination of (2) and (7). The optimal discount curve that minimizes this new norm would trade off smoothness against locality, depending on the weight used in the definition of the norm.

5 Multi-curve estimation example

After the credit crisis of 2008 it became clear that using one and the same curve for both discounting and projecting cashflows was no longer realistic. Today's market standard is to use overnight indexed swaps (OIS) to extract a risk-free curve for the purpose of discounting cashflows and to use separate curves to project forward rates with different tenors. We show in this example how the second-order smoothing pseudoinverse method can easily be used to extract all these different curves from market data.[7]

Table 2 shows quotes of four different swap instruments from the eurozone market as of 4th of November 2013. The first is an OIS that pays fixed and receives floating tied to EONIA. EONIA swaps with maturity longer than one year have annual payment frequency on both legs while those with maturity less than one year only have a cashflow at maturity. The second swap instrument pays fixed and receives floating tied to 6M EURIBOR. The 6M EURIBOR swap has annual payments on its fixed leg and semi-annual on the floating leg. The remaining two swap instruments are basis swaps that swap cashflows tied to floating rates. The first one swaps 3M EURIBOR against 6M EURIBOR and the second one 1M

[7]The results using the first-order smoothing pseudoinverse are qualitatively similar and therefore omitted from the paper. The reason why the difference is not as pronounced as in the single-curve case is due to the fact that we are directly extracting the forward curves instead of first extracting a discount curve and calculating the forward rates only in a second step.

EURIBOR against 6M EURIBOR. These swaps are quoted in terms of the spread that has to be added to the shorter leg such that the two legs have identical present value.

The curve $T \mapsto P_{OIS}(t_0, T)$ used for discounting is extracted from the OIS quotes. This can be done with the pseudoinverse method in exactly the same way as in the single-curve example. The result using the second-order pseudoinverse method is shown in Figure 4. Apart from the overnight EONIA rate, which matures at $t_{o/n} := 07/11/213$, all payment frequencies are multiples of one month. In the following we therefore consider a time grid $T = \{t_{o/n}, t_1, \ldots, t_N\}$ where t_i and t_{i-1}, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, are one month apart and $N = 30 \times 12$.

We now turn to the instruments that swap the 6M EURIBOR against a fixed rate. These instruments are quoted in terms of the swap rate K that equates the value of the fixed and the floating leg:

$$K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(t_{12(i-1)}, t_{12i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{12i}) = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \delta(t_{6(i-1)}, t_{6i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{6i}) F_6(t_0, t_{6i}),$$

where t_{12n} is the maturity of the swap and $F_k(t_0, t_i)$ denotes the k-month forward rate at time t_0 with reference period $[t_{i-k}, t_i]$. With our estimate for the OIS discount curve we are able to value the fixed leg of this swap. Notice that the right-hand side is a linear function of the unknown 6M forward rates with known coefficients. In other words, using our methodology from before we are able to extract the smoothest possible 6M forward curve that exactly fits the quoted swap rates. The pricing system therefore becomes $Cf = p$, where $f = (F_6(t_0, t_6), \ldots, F_6(t_0, t_N))^\top$, the price vector p takes the form

$$p = \left(F_6(t_0, t_6),\, K\delta(t_0, t_{12}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{12}),\, \ldots,\, K \sum_{i=1}^{30} \delta(t_{12(i-1)}, t_{12i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{12i}) \right)^\top$$

and the first three rows of the 'cashflow' matrix C for become:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \delta(t_0,t_6)P_{OIS}(t_0,t_6) & \delta(t_6,t_{12})P_{OIS}(t_0,t_{12}) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \delta(t_0,t_6)P_{OIS}(t_0,t_6) & \delta(t_6,t_{12})P_{OIS}(t_0,t_{12}) & \delta(t_{12},t_{24})P_{OIS}(t_0,t_{24}) & \delta(t_{24},t_{36})P_{OIS}(t_0,t_{36}) & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next to the quotes of the swaps, we also included here the given 6M EURIBOR spot rate $F_6(t_0, t_6)$ by adding the row $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ to the matrix C and the rate to the vector p.

In a next step we use our newly obtained 6M forward curve to extract the 3M forward curve from the 3M-6M tenor basis swaps. Basis swaps are quoted in terms of the spread S that has to be added to the leg with the highest frequency in order to equate the value of both legs:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^{2n} \delta(t_{6(i-1)}, t_{6i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{6i}) F_6(t_0, t_{6i}) \\ =&\sum_{i=1}^{4n} \delta(t_{3(i-1)}, t_{3i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{3i}) (F_3(t_0, t_{3i}) + S). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms we get:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2n} \delta(t_{6(i-1)}, t_{6i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{6i}) F_6(t_0, t_{6i}) - S \sum_{i=1}^{4n} \delta(t_{3(i-1)}, t_{3i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{3i})$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{4n} \delta(t_{3(i-1)}, t_{3i}) P_{OIS}(t_0, t_{3i}) F_3(t_0, t_{3i}).$$

The left-hand side can be evaluated with the discount and 6M forward curve we have extracted earlier and the right-hand side is a linear function of the unknown 3M forward rates. We can therefore use the pseudoinverse method to extract the 3M forward curve. Once again we can also easily include the spot 3M EURIBOR rate $F_3(t_0, t_3)$. In a very similar fashion we also obtain the 1M forward curve from the 1M-3M basis swap quotes, where also include the spot 1M EURIBOR rate $F_1(t_0, t_1)$. All three curves are plotted in Figure 5.

Remark 5.1. *Although EONIA swaps are quoted up to 60 years of maturity, it is sometimes argued that the EONIA swaps with maturity longer than 1 year are not sufficiently liquid to be used in the construction of the OIS discount curve. The remaining part of the curve is instead often calculated from OIS-3M basis swaps, which are more actively traded. This does however create a circular dependency between the OIS discount curve, the 3M forward and 6M forward curves. The easy extension of the pseudoinverse method to the multi-curve world was mainly due to the fact that we can estimate all the curves one by one. If we have to estimate part of the OIS discount curve from OIS-3M swaps, then we need to solve for all three curves at once. The is problematic because in the swap valuations the forward rates are multiplied with the discount rates, i.e. we face non-linear constraints in our optimization problem. One possible workaround is to jointly estimate the OIS discount curve $g_1(x) := P_{OIS}(t_0, x)$ and the 'discounted' forward curves $g_2(x) := P_{OIS}(t_0, x)F_3(t_0, x)$, $g_3(x) := P_{OIS}(t_0, x)F_6(t_0, x)$. By smoothing the discount curve and discounted forward curves, we are again solving an optimization problem with linear constraints:*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g_1, g_2, g_3 \in H_2} \quad & \|g_1\|_{H_2}^2 + \|g_2\|_{H_2}^2 + \|g_3\|_{H_2}^2 \\ s.t. \quad & M_1 g_1 + M_2 g_2 + M_3 g_3 = p, \end{aligned}$$

for some appropriately defined linear maps M_1, M_2 and M_3. We leave the implementation of this extension to the interested reader.

6 Conclusion

We have introduced a novel method based on the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse to extract a discount curve that exactly reproduces the prices of the input instruments and that has maximal smoothness in the sense that it has minimal integrated squared first-order derivatives (squared initial slope plus integrated squared second-order derivatives). The optimal discount curve is given in closed-form as a piecewise-linear or piecewise-cubic function. Our method is more than a simple spline interpolation since we do not

assume given zero-coupon bond prices (or, equivalently, yields). The input instruments are only assumed to have a price that is linear in the discount curve (i.e. have deterministic cashflows). The explicit nature of our solution makes it very convenient to compute delta-sensitivities because of the low computational burden. We have seen in a practical example that the second-order smoothing criterion outperforms the first-order smoothing criterion in terms of regularity of the shape, however this comes at the cost of a lowered locality.

Further research directions include investigating the nonnegativity of the interpolated rates. Indeed, there is no theoretical requirement that the estimated discount curve is positive and monotonically non-increasing, which is needed to guarantee nonnegative forward rates.

A Proofs

This appendix contains all proofs.

Proof of Lemma 3.1

From the definition of the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1}$ we get:

$$\langle \phi_\tau, g \rangle_{H_1} = g(0)\phi_\tau(0) + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} g'(x)\phi'_\tau(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = g(\tau).$$

From the above relation it is clear that

$$\phi_\tau(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi'_\tau(x) = 1_{[0,\tau]}(x), \quad x \in (0, \bar{\tau}).$$

Simple integration now gives:

$$\phi_\tau(x) = 1 + \int_0^x 1_{(0,\tau)}(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 1 + x \wedge \tau.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2

The transpose (adjoint operator) $M^\top : \mathbb{R}^n \to H_1$ of the linear map $M \colon H_1 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by:

$$\langle Mg, z \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \langle g, M^\top z \rangle_{H_1}, \quad \forall g \in H_1, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Using the definition of M and the Riesz representation of the linear functional Φ we easily get:

$$M^\top z = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \phi_{x_j} C_j^\top z, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where C_j represents the j-th column of the matrix C.

The Lagrangian for problem (5) is $\mathcal{L}(g,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\|g\|_{H_1}^2 + \lambda^\top (Mg - p)$. The first-order conditions read

$$\begin{aligned} g + M^\top \lambda &= 0 \\ Mg - p &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain as unique solution $g^* = M^+ p$, where the map

$$M^+ \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to H_1,\ z \mapsto M^\top \left(MM^\top\right)^{-1} z,$$

is known as the *Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse* of the linear map M. The theorem then follows after observing that $MM^\top = CAC^\top$. The matrix components A_{ij}, $i,j = 1,\dots,n$, are easily calculated using the definition of the scalar product in (2):

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \langle \phi_{x_i}, \phi_{x_j} \rangle_{H_1} \\ &= \phi_{x_i}(0)\phi_{x_j}(0) + \int_0^{\bar\tau} \phi'_{x_i}(x)\phi'_{x_j}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= 1 + x_i \wedge x_j. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the matrix $CAC^\top$ is invertible because A is invertible and C has full rank.

Proof of Lemma 3.5

From the definition of the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_2}$ and the integration by parts formula we get:

$$g(0)\psi_\tau(0) + g'(0)\psi'_\tau(0) + g'(\bar\tau)\psi''_\tau(\bar\tau) - g'(0)\psi''_\tau(0) - \int_0^{\bar\tau} g'(x)\psi'''_\tau(x)\ \mathrm{d}x = g(\tau). \tag{11}$$

We therefore obtain the following conditions for the function ψ_τ:

$$\begin{cases} \psi_\tau(0) = 1 \\ \psi'_\tau(0) = \psi''_\tau(0) \\ \psi''_\tau(\bar\tau) = 0 \\ \psi'''_\tau(x) = -1_{[0,\tau]}(x), \quad x \in [0,\bar\tau]\backslash\{0,\tau\}. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Integrating the last equation in (12) we get:

$$\psi''_\tau(x) = \psi''_\tau(0) - x \wedge \tau, \quad x \in [0,\bar\tau]. \tag{13}$$

From $\tau \le \bar\tau$ and $\psi''_\tau(\bar\tau) = 0$ we get:

$$\psi'_\tau(0) = \psi''_\tau(0) = \tau.$$

Finally integrating (13) two more times we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi''_\tau(x) &= \tau - x \wedge \tau, \quad x \in [0,\bar\tau] \\ \psi'_\tau(x) &= \tau - \tfrac{1}{2}(x \wedge \tau)^2 + \tau(x \wedge \tau), \quad x \in [0,\bar\tau] \\ \psi_\tau(x) &= 1 - \tfrac{1}{6}(x \wedge \tau)^3 + \tfrac{\tau}{2}(x \wedge \tau)^2 - \tfrac{\tau^2}{2}(x \wedge \tau) + x(1 + \tfrac{\tau}{2})\tau, \quad x \in [0,\bar\tau]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.6

The proof is completely identical to that of Theorem 3.2. The matrix components B_{ij}, $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$, are readily calculated from the definition of the norm in (7) and the expressions derived in the proof of Lemma 3.5. Suppose $x_i < x_j$ then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij} &= \langle \psi_{x_i}, \psi_{x_j} \rangle_{H_2} \\ &= \psi_{x_i}(0)\psi_{x_j}(0) + \psi'_{x_i}(0)\psi'_{x_j}(0) + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \psi''_{x_i}(x)\psi''_{x_j}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= 1 + x_i x_j + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} (x_i - x \wedge x_i)(x_j - x \wedge x_j)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= 1 + x_i x_j + \int_0^{x_i} (x_i - x)(x_j - x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{6}x_i^3 + x_i x_j \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}x_i\right). \end{aligned}$$

B Pseudoinverse on the Euclidean space

For readers unfamiliar with infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, we introduce in this appendix a discrete analogue of the method introduced in Section 3. Instead of looking for a continuous curve in a Hilbert function space, we now search for a discrete vector of discount factors in the Euclidian space which has maximal smoothness in some sense. Suppose we are interested in the discount factors at dates $t_0 < u_1 < \cdots < u_K$:

$$d = (P(t_0, u_1), \ldots, P(t_0, u_K))^\top$$

for some $K \geq 1$. Suppose furthermore that d contains all the discount factors that are required to value the n instruments we observe, i.e. $\{t_1, \ldots, t_N\} \subseteq \{u_1, \ldots, u_K\}$. Redefine C as the cashflow matrix of the n observed fixed income instruments on the dates $\{u_1, \ldots, u_K\}$. If we denote by $\|\cdot\|_K^2$ the Euclidian norm on $\mathbb{R}^K$, then using standard Lagrange multiplier techniques one can show that the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & \tfrac{1}{2}\|x\|_K^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Cx = p. \end{aligned}$$

admits the following the unique solution x^*:

$$x^* = M^+ y, \quad \text{with} \quad M^+ := M^\top (M M^\top)^{-1}.$$

The $K \times n$ matrix M^+ is known in linear algebra as the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of the matrix M.

B.1 Optimal first-order smoothness

To obtain a discrete approximation of the smoothness criterion in (2) we approximate the integral by a right Riemann sum and the derivative with a first order backward finite difference scheme (or, equivalently, a left Riemann sum and a first order forward difference scheme):

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{t_0}^{u_K} \left|\partial_T P(t_0,T)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}T &\approx \sum_{i=1}^{K} \left(\partial_T P(t_0,u_i)\right)^2 \delta_i \\ &\approx \sum_{i=1}^{K} \left(\frac{P(t_0,u_i)-P(t_0,u_{i-1})}{\delta_i}\right)^2 \delta_i, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $u_0 = t_0$ and δ_i represents the time between u_{i-1} and u_i according to the relevant day-count convention. Note that the time grid points $u_0, \ldots, u_K$ are not necessarily spaced equidistantly. Our goal therefore becomes to find the solution d^* to the under-determined system $Cd = p$ that minimizes the criterion in (14).

To find this optimally smooth exact solution, we first define the vector Δ of maturity-weighted increments of the discount curve:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \left(\tfrac{P(t_0,t_1)-P_0}{\sqrt{\delta_1}}, \tfrac{P(t_0,u_2)-P(t_0,u_1)}{\sqrt{\delta_2}}, \ldots, \tfrac{P(t_0,u_K)-P(t_0,u_{K-1})}{\sqrt{\delta_K}}\right)^\top \\ &= W\left(A\,d + v\right), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

with $P_0 = P(t_0,t_0) = 1$, $v = \left(-P_0, 0, \ldots, 0\right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, and $K \times K$ matrices

$$W = \operatorname{diag}\left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_1}}, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_K}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & & \vdots \\ 0 & -1 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the matrices W and A are invertible, we can uniquely solve the linear equation in (15) for the discount vector d:

$$d = A^{-1}\left(W^{-1}\Delta - v\right). \tag{16}$$

Substituting (16) back into the pricing system (1) results in:

$$CA^{-1}W^{-1}\Delta = p + CA^{-1}v. \tag{17}$$

Remark that the cashflow matrix C in general has linearly independent rows. The matrix $M := CA^{-1}W^{-1}$ inherits this full rank property of C and therefore the solution Δ^* to the

system in (17) which has minimal Euclidian norm among all possible solutions is given by:

$$\Delta^* = M^+ \left(p + CA^{-1}v\right),$$

where M^+ is the pseudoinverse of the matrix M. The corresponding discount vector d^* can now be recovered through relationship (16) with Δ replaced by Δ^*.

By definition, minimizing the Euclidian norm of Δ is equivalent to minimizing the smoothness criterion in (14) and therefore we conclude that d^* is the unique solution of $Cd = p$ with maximal smoothness in the sense of (14).

B.2 Optimal second-order smoothness

Similarly as in the previous section, we cast smoothness criterion in (7) in a discrete form over a grid $t_0 = u_0 < \cdots < u_K$ using a right Riemann sum and backward finite difference approximation for the integral and derivative, respectively. Since we are dealing with a second-order derivative this time, we are only able to smooth the curve over the interval $[u_1, u_K]$ instead of $[t_0, u_K]$. This is because at every grid point in the right Riemann sum we need two prior points in order to evaluate the second-order backward finite difference expression. The discrete smoothness criterion we aim to minimize thus becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{u_1}^{u_K} |\partial_T^2 P(t_0,T)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}T &\approx \sum_{i=2}^{K} \left(\partial_T^2 P(t_0,u_i)\right)^2 \delta_i \\
&\approx \sum_{i=2}^{K} \left(\frac{\partial_T P(t_0,u_i) - \partial_T P(t_0,u_{i-1})}{\delta_i}\right)^2 \delta_i \\
&\approx \sum_{i=2}^{K} \left(\frac{P(t_0,u_i)\delta_i^{-1} - P(t_0,u_{i-1})\left(\delta_i^{-1} + \delta_{i-1}^{-1}\right) + P(t_0,u_{i-2})\delta_{i-1}^{-1}}{\delta_i^{1/2}}\right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

In order to reproduce the original discount bond prices from (weighted) second-order differences, we need to know the first two bond prices, i.e. $P(t_0,t_0)$ and $P(t_0,u_1)$. This was no issue in the previous section because we have $P_0 = P(t_0,t_0) = 1$ by definition. In this case, however, we also need to know $P(t_0,u_1)$. In practice this should not give any problems since the discount factors of the first grid points are typically known exactly from observed instruments (e.g. using short-term LIBOR rates). We thus assume we have an instrument that provides us with the the price $P_1 := P(t_0,u_1)$ and we take it out of our cashflow matrix and price vector. Denoting the reduced matrix and vector again respectively by C and p, the pricing system now becomes:

$$Cd = p, \quad \text{with} \quad d = \begin{pmatrix} P(t_0,u_2) & \dots & P(t_0,u_K) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

Remark B.1. *If one of the remaining instruments, say instrument k, has a cashflow c_{k1} at u_1, then we simply subtract $c_{k1}P_1$ from its price on the right-hand side of the pricing equation.*

Similarly as before we again define a vector Δ in the following way:

$$\Delta := W\,(A\,d + v)$$

where

$$W = \operatorname{diag}\left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_2}}, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_K}}\right), \quad v = \left(\tfrac{P_0}{\delta_1} - (\tfrac{P_1}{\delta_2} + \tfrac{P_1}{\delta_1}), \tfrac{P_1}{\delta_2}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)^\top,$$

$$A = \operatorname{diag}\left(\tfrac{1}{\delta_2}, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{\delta_K}\right) - \operatorname{diag}_{-1}\left(\tfrac{1}{\delta_3} + \tfrac{1}{\delta_2}, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{\delta_K} + \tfrac{1}{\delta_{K-1}}\right) + \operatorname{diag}_{-2}\left(\tfrac{1}{\delta_3}, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{\delta_{K-1}}\right),$$

where $\operatorname{diag}_n(x)$ is a matrix with the vector x on its n-th diagonal and zeros elsewhere. Proceeding in exactly the same fashion as in the previous section, we obtain the following solution d^* to the pricing system in (19) which has minimal curvature among all possible solutions:

$$d^* = A^{-1}\left(W^{-1}\Delta^* - v\right), \quad \Delta^* = M^+\left(p + CA^{-1}v\right), \quad M = CA^{-1}W^{-1}.$$

In the limit as $K \to \infty$ these two methods produce the same results as their Hilbert function space counterparts.

Maturity date	Market quote (%)	Instrument
$S_1 = 04/10/2012$	0.1501	o/n LIBOR
$S_2 = 05/11/2012$	0.2135	1M LIBOR
$S_3 = 03/01/2013$	0.3553	3M LIBOR
$T_1 = 20/03/2013$	99.685	Futures
$T_2 = 19/06/2013$	99.675	Futures
$T_3 = 18/09/2013$	99.655	Futures
$T_4 = 18/12/2013$	99.645	Futures
$T_5 = 19/03/2014$	99.620	Futures
$U_2 = 03/10/2014$	0.361	Swap
$U_3 = 05/10/2015$	0.431	Swap
$U_4 = 03/10/2016$	0.564	Swap
$U_5 = 03/10/2017$	0.754	Swap
$U_7 = 03/10/2019$	1.174	Swap
$U_{10} = 03/10/2022$	1.683	Swap
$U_{15} = 04/10/2027$	2.192	Swap
$U_{20} = 04/10/2032$	2.405	Swap
$U_{30} = 03/10/2042$	2.579	Swap

Table 1: Market quotes for LIBOR rates, futures prices and swap rates from the USD market as of 1st of October 2012. All contracts are spot $(T + 2)$ starting. Source: Bloomberg.

Tenor	EONIA-Fix (%)	6M-Fix (%)	3M-6M (bps)	1M-3M (bps)	Cash (%)
o/n	0.092				
1m	0.102				0.129
3m	0.109				0.227
6m	0.108				0.342
9m	0.121				
1y	0.130	0.386	10.85	8.90	
2y	0.205	0.482	12.15	10.90	
3y	0.334	0.656	12.85	12.60	
4y	0.533	0.870	13.00	13.70	
5y	0.742	1.097	12.95	14.20	
6y	0.952	1.306	12.70	14.30	
7y	1.145	1.503	12.35	14.20	
8y	1.328	1.677	11.90	14.00	
9y	1.479	1.833	11.40	13.80	
10y	1.625	1.973	10.90	13.60	
11y	1.757	2.095			
12y	1.872	2.199			
15y	2.124	2.418	8.85	11.80	
20y	2.317	2.570	7.40	10.10	
25y	2.385	2.618	6.50	8.90	
30y	2.406	2.625	5.90	8.10	

Table 2: Mid swap rates for EONIA swaps, 6M EURIBOR swaps, 3M-6M basis swaps, 1M-6M basis swaps and EURIBOR cash rates as of 04/11/2013. Source: Bloomberg.



(a) Full maturity spectrum.

(b) Zoom on short end of Figure 1a.

Figure 1: Simple spot rate, yield and consecutive simple forward rates computed from the bootstrapped zero-coupon bond prices using USD money market and swap market data as of 1st of October 2012.



(a) First-order smoothing criterion.



(b) Zoom on short end of Figure 2a.



(c) Second-order smoothing criterion.



(d) Zoom on short end of Figure 2c.

Figure 2: Simple spot rate, yield and simple forward rates computed from the discount curve obtained by the continuous pseudoinverse method using USD money market and swap market data as of 1st of October 2012.



(a) Bumped 3M LIBOR, first-order smoothing.



(b) Bumped 3M LIBOR, second-order smoothing.



(c) Bumped Sep13 futures, first-order smoothing.



(d) Bumped Sep13 futures, second-order smoothing.



(e) Bumped 15y swap, first-order smoothing.



(f) Bumped 15y swap, second-order smoothing.

Figure 3: Absolute basis points change in the instantaneous forward curve when bumping the 3M LIBOR rate, the September 2013 futures rate and the 15 year swap rate by one basis point.



Figure 4: Discount curve extracted from OIS mid swap rates as of 04/11/2013 using the second-order smoothing pseudoinverse method.



Figure 5: Forward curves with tenors one, three and six months estimated using the second-order smoothing pseudoinverse method. For comparison purposes the graph also shows the one month simple forward rate obtained from the OIS discounting curve.

References

Adams, K. (2001). Smooth interpolation of zero curves. *Algo Research Quarterly 4*(1/2), 11–22.

Adams, K. J. and D. R. Van Deventer (1994). Fitting yield curves and forward rate curves with maximum smoothness. *The Journal of Fixed Income 4*(1), 52–62.

Andersen, L. (2007). Discount curve construction with tension splines. *Review of Derivatives Research 10*(3), 227–267.

Deaves, R. and M. Parlar (2000). A generalized bootstrap method to determine the yield curve. *Applied Mathematical Finance 7*(4), 257–270.

Delbaen, F. and S. Lorimier (1992). Estimation of the yield curve and the forward rate curve starting from a finite number of observations. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 11*(4), 259–269.

Fisher, M., D. W. Nychka, and D. Zervos (1995). Fitting the term structure of interest rates with smoothing splines. Technical report, Federal Reserve System.

Hagan, P. S. and G. West (2006). Interpolation methods for curve construction. *Applied Mathematical Finance 13*(2), 89–129.

Hagan, P. S. and G. West (2008). Methods for constructing a yield curve. *Wilmott Magazine, May*, 70–81.

Lim, K. G. and Q. Xiao (2002). Computing maximum smoothness forward rate curves. *Statistics and Computing 12*(3), 275–279.

McCulloch, J. H. (1971). Measuring the term structure of interest rates. *The Journal of Business 44*(1), 19–31.

McCulloch, J. H. (1975). The tax-adjusted yield curve. *The Journal of Finance 30*(3), 811–830.

Nelson, C. R. and A. F. Siegel (1987). Parsimonious modeling of yield curves. *The Journal of Business*, 473–489.

Riesz, F. (1909). Sur les opérations fonctionnelles linéaires. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris 149*(974-997), 12.

Steeley, J. M. (1991). Estimating the gilt-edged term structure: Basis splines and confidence intervals. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting 18*(4), 513–529.

Svensson, L. E. (1994). Estimating and interpreting forward interest rates: Sweden 1992-1994. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Vasicek, O. A. and H. G. Fong (1982). Term structure modeling using exponential splines. *The Journal of Finance 37*(2), 339–348.